UG-FT-314/14
CAFPE-184/14
RM3-TH/14-16

A new physics interpretation of the IceCube data

arXiv:1410.3208v2 [hep-ph] 18 Dec 2014

José Ignacio Illana[a], Manuel Masip[a], Davide Meloni[b]

[a] *CAFPE and Departamento de Física Teórica y del Cosmos*
Universidad de Granada, E-18071 Granada, Spain

[b] *Dipartimento di Matematica e Fisica*
Università di Roma Tre, I-00146 Rome, Italy

jillana@ugr.es, masip@ugr.es, meloni@fis.uniroma3.it

Abstract

IceCube has recently observed 37 events of TeV–PeV energies. The angular distribution, with a strong preference for downgoing directions, the spectrum, and the small muon to shower ratio in the data can *not* be accommodated assuming standard interactions of atmospheric neutrinos. We obtain an excellent fit, however, if a diffuse flux of ultrahigh energy (cosmogenic) neutrinos experiences collisions where only a small fraction of the energy is transferred to the target nucleon. We show that consistent models of TeV gravity or other non-Wilsonian completions of the standard model provide cross sections with these precise features. An increased statistics could clearly distinguish our scenario from the one assumed by IceCube (a diffuse flux of astrophysical neutrinos with a $\propto E^{-2}$ spectrum) and establish the need for new physics in the interpretation of the data.

1 Introduction

Neutrinos define the only sector of the standard model (SM) where some basic questions have no answer yet. We do not know, for example, whether they are Dirac or Majorana spinors, or whether the sector includes additional sterile modes. Although neutrinos are related by the gauge symmetry to the electron and the other charged leptons, the absence of electric charge makes them a very *different* particle. From an experimental point of view their invisibility is an obvious challenge that, at the same time, provides unexpected opportunities in the search for new physics. Like protons or photons, neutrinos are produced with very high energies in astrophysical processes; unlike these particles, they may cross large distances and reach with no energy loss the center of a neutrino telescope like IceCube. Once there, the relative frequence $\omega_{\rm NP}$ of neutrino interactions involving new physics will be enhanced by their small SM cross section:

$$\omega_{\rm NP} \approx \frac{\sigma^{\nu N}_{\rm NP}}{\sigma^{\nu N}_{\rm SM}} \,. \tag{1}$$

As we will see, the large target mass in a clean environment (only contaminated by atmospheric muons) at telescopes defines the ideal ground to probe a class of ultraviolet (UV) completions of the SM.

In this article we will be interested in the 37 events of energy above 30 TeV observed between the years 2010 and 2013 by IceCube [1, 2]. Their analysis has shown that these events can *not* be explained with standard interactions of atmospheric neutrinos, even if the lepton flux from charmed hadron decays were anomalously high. In the next section we review the IceCube analysis and their interpretation, namely, that the origin of these events is a diffuse flux of cosmic neutrinos with a $\propto E^{-2}$ spectrum. We will argue that the data admits other interpretations, and in Section 3 we describe a new physics scenario that does the work. In Section 4 we show that very *soft* collisions of cosmogenic neutrinos (with energy around 10^9 GeV) mediated by this new physics would provide an excellent fit to the data, and that an increased statistics could clearly discriminate this hypothesis from the standard one.

2 IceCube data

The IceCube analysis isolates neutrino events of energy $\gtrsim 30$ TeV coming from any direction. Depending on whether the events include the characteristic track of a muon, they are divided into *tracks* and *showers*. The directionality in track events is very good, whereas the pointlike topology of the showers introduces a $\pm 15^\circ$ uncertainty.



Figure 1: *(a) Probability $P_{\rm surv}$ that a neutrino reaches IceCube from a zenith angle θ_z for several energies E_ν (we have used the νN cross section in [3]). (b) Atmospheric [4] and cosmogenic [6] neutrino fluxes integrated over all directions and including all flavors.*

The analysis tries to eliminate muon tracks entering the detector from outside. This also reduces by a factor of ≈ 0.5 the number of atmospheric neutrino events from downgoing directions. An expected muon background of 8.4 ± 4.2 events remains, which seems consistent with the 5 events (one of them containing two coincident muons from unrelated air showers) where the muon track starts near the detector boundary. We will in principle exclude* events number 3, 8, 18, 28, 32 together with the 8.4 ± 4.2 background from our analysis, assuming that we are then left with 32 *genuine* neutrino interactions inside the IceCube detector, and we will comment on how the inclusion of these events would affect our results.

We define two energy bins (30 – 300 TeV and 300 – 3000 TeV) and three direction bins: *downgoing*, which includes declinations $-90^\circ \le \delta < -20^\circ$ ($\delta = \theta_z - 90^\circ$), *near-horizontal* ($-20^\circ \le \delta < +20^\circ$) and *upgoing* ($+20^\circ \le \delta < +90^\circ$). The Earth is unable to absorb neutrinos from downgoing and near-horizontal directions at all the energies of interest, but it becomes opaque from upgoing directions (see Fig. 1a), especially in the high energy bin. For example, a 100 TeV (1 PeV) neutrino has only a 58% (21%) probability to reach IceCube from the $+20^\circ \le \delta < +90^\circ$ bin.

To estimate the number of atmospheric events we will use the fluxes in Fig. 1b. We have

*We think that these ambiguous events could be excluded just by increasing the thresholds in IceTop and the veto region.

	Data	Atm	E^{-2}	Data	Atm	E^{-2}	
Tracks	2	0.8	0.6	0	0.0	0.1	UPGOING
Showers	5	2.7	3.6	0	0.0	0.7	$(+20^\circ < \delta < +90^\circ)$
Tracks	2	3.5	1.5	0	0.0	0.5	NEAR HORIZONTAL
Showers	8	5.9	6.4	1	0.2	2.6	$(-20^\circ < \delta < +20^\circ)$
Tracks	0	0.2	1.6	0	0.0	0.6	DOWNGOING
Showers	11	0.6	6.5	3	0.0	2.9	$(-90^\circ < \delta < -20^\circ)$
	30 – 300 TeV			300 – 3000 TeV			

Table 1: *Data, atmospheric background, and best fit of the excess with a E^{-2} diffuse flux at IceCube in 988 days.*

separated the neutrino flux into the standard component from pion and kaon decays plus another component from charmed hadron decays. The first one has a strong dependence on the zenith angle (it is larger from horizontal directions) and is dominated (in an approximate 17:1 ratio) by the muon over the electron neutrino flavor. The charm component is isotropic and contains both flavors with the same frequency, together with a 2% ν_τ component.

The 32 neutrino events and our estimate for the atmospheric background can be found in Table 1. An inspection of the data reveals two clear features:

1. The number and distribution of tracks is well explained by atmospheric neutrinos. In the low-energy bin there are 4 tracks from upgoing and near-horizontal directions for an expected background of 4.3, whereas at higher energies there are no events but just 0.06 tracks expected. If we added the 5 downgoing tracks excluded in our analysis together with the 8.4 ± 4.2 muon background, we would expect a total of 12.9 track events and find only 9 in the data: again, no need for extra tracks.

2. There is an excess of showers that is especially significant from downgoing directions. At low energies we find 11 events for 0.6 expected, and in the 300 – 3000 TeV bin there are 3 showers for a 0.04 background. If we include near-horizontal directions we obtain a total of 23 events for just 6.7 expected.

IceCube then proposes a fit to the excess using a diffuse flux of astrophysical neutrinos with spectrum proportional to E^{-2} (also in Table 1). We find that this E^{-2} hypothesis has two generic implications. First, it gives around 4.5 showers per track. Second, it implies a very similar number of downgoing and near-horizontal events (see Table 1). To compare it with the data we just subtract the atmospheric background. We obtain:

- An excess of 18.6 showers (28 observed, 9.4 expected) while no tracks (4 observed, 4.5 expected). The IceCube hypothesis introduces 18.4 showers and 4.2 tracks.
- An excess of 13.2 downgoing events but just 1.4 extra events from near-horizontal directions. The E^{-2} diffuse flux proposed by IceCube predicts, respectively, 11.6 and 11.0 events.

Therefore, although the statistical significance of these deviations is not conclusive yet [7], it is apparent that other possibilities may give a better fit. In particular, we will define a new physics scenario that only introduces near-horizontal and downgoing showers (in a 1:2 ratio) with no new muon tracks from any directions.

3 A consistent model of TeV gravity

Consider a model of gravity [8] with one flat extra dimension y of radius R and a fundamental scale[†] $\bar{M}_5 \approx 1$ TeV. Since the generalized Newton's constant in D dimensions is $G_D = V_n G_N$, this setup requires a very large extra dimension:

$$V_1 = 2\pi R = \frac{\bar{M}_P^2}{\bar{M}_5^3} \tag{2}$$

i.e., $R \approx (10^{-27}\ \text{GeV})^{-1} \approx 1$ AU. A change from $1/r$ to $1/r^2$ in the gravitational potential at such large distances would of course have been observed. The model is also excluded by astrophysical [10] and cosmological [11] bounds. This can be understood in terms of the Kaluza-Klein (KK) modes, of mass $m_n = n m_c$ with $m_c = 1/R$. Although each excitation couples very weakly ($\propto \bar{M}_P^{-1}$) to matter, the large multiplicity of light states during primordial nucleosynthesis or supernova explosions would introduce unacceptable changes in the dynamics.

We intend to solve these problems while keeping the main features of the model. In particular,

1. We will keep the same $\bar{M}_5 \approx 1$ TeV. M_5 is the scale (μ) where gravity becomes strong: the number of light KK modes ($2\mu/m_c$) times their coupling squared to matter ($\mu^2/\bar{M}_P^2$) gives an amplitude of order 1 at $\mu = M_5$.

[†]We will follow the notation in [9]: $\bar{M}_P = M_P/\sqrt{8\pi}$ and $\bar{M}_D = M_D/(2\pi)^{n/(2+n)}$, where $n = D-4$ is the number of extra dimensions. Using this notation $G_D = G_N(2\pi R)^n = 1/(8\pi \bar{M}_D^{2+n})$ for any value of n, including $n = 0$.

2. In order to avoid astrophysical and cosmological bounds, we will increase the mass of the first KK mode and the mass gap between excitations from $m_c = 1/R$ to $m_c \geq 50$ MeV. Obviously, since now there are *less* KK gravitons, consistency with the previous point will require that the coupling squared of each mode is increased by a factor of $m_c \bar{M}_P^2 / M_5^3$.

Notice that doing that the gravitational potential at distances $r < 1/m_c$ (approximately 4 fm for $m_c = 50$ MeV) will be exactly the same as in the case of one very large compact dimension: the smaller density of KK modes is exactly compensated by their larger coupling. The main difference is that now gravity becomes 4-dimensional at distances much shorter than before, $r > 1/m_c$ instead of $r > 1$ AU.

The framework just outlined would be an explicit realization of the UV completion by classicalization discussed in [12, 13], and it has been defined by Giudice, Plehn and Strumia in [14] as follows (see also [15]). Let us deform the flat circle described above to an orbifold by identifying $y \to -y$, and let us place 4-dim branes at $y = 0$ (IR brane) and $y = \pi R$ (UV brane). We will also introduce a (slight) warping along the extra dimension:

$$\mathrm{d}s^2 = e^{2\sigma(y)} \eta_{\mu\nu} \, \mathrm{d}x^\mu \mathrm{d}x^\nu + \mathrm{d}y^2 \,, \quad \sigma(y) \equiv k \, |y| \,. \tag{3}$$

The 4-dim Planck mass is then given by

$$\bar{M}_P^2 = \frac{\bar{M}_5^3}{k} \left(e^{2k\pi R} - 1 \right) . \tag{4}$$

If the 5-dim curvature is $k \ll 1/R$ we recover in Eq. (4) the flat case,

$$\bar{M}_P^2 \approx \bar{M}_5^3 \, 2\pi R \,, \tag{5}$$

together with a tower of KK gravitons with mass $m_n = n/R$ and coupling[‡] $\approx \sqrt{2}\mu/\bar{M}_P$. We will take, however, the opposite limit: k larger than R^{-1} but still much smaller than $\bar{M}_5$. For example, we obtain $\bar{M}_5 = 1$ TeV in Eq. (4) for $k = 50$ MeV and $R = (5 \text{ MeV})^{-1} = 40$ fm. The curvature has then two main effects on the KK gravitons [14]: their masses become proportional to $\pi k \equiv m_c$,

$$m_n \approx \left(n + \frac{1}{4} \right) k\pi = \left(n + \frac{1}{4} \right) m_c \,, \tag{6}$$

and their 5-dim wave function is *pushed* towards the IR brane. Assuming that quarks and neutrinos are located there, this will translate into a larger coupling of all the gravitons to matter,

$$\frac{\sqrt{2}}{\bar{M}_P} \to \sqrt{\frac{k}{\bar{M}_5^3}} \approx \sqrt{\frac{2m_c}{M_5^3}} \,. \tag{7}$$

[‡]Notice that the orbifolding projects out half of the KK modes but also increases by a factor of $\sqrt{2}$ their coupling to matter.

This is exactly the factor discussed above. In short, this TeV gravity model has just one extra dimension, a low fundamental scale $M_5 \approx 1$ TeV, and an arbitrary mass $m_c \geq 50$ MeV for the first KK mode. Given the (approximately) constant mass gap between resonances and their enhanced coupling to matter, the model gives at distances $r < m_c^{-1}$ the same gravitational potential as a model with one flat extra dimension of length $L \approx 1$ AU, while at $r > m_c^{-1}$ it implies Newton's 4-dim gravity.

Once the setup has been justified, we can consider graviton-mediated collisions at center of mass energies $s > M_5^2$, *i.e.*, in the transplanckian regime [16]. In particular, we will be interested in scatterings with large impact parameter: distances longer than the typical ones to form a black hole (and thus with a larger cross section) but still shorter than $1/m_c$, so that gravity is still purely 5-dimensional. In these processes the incident neutrino interacts with a parton in the target nucleon, transfers a small fraction[§] $y = (E_\nu - E'_\nu)/E_\nu$ of its energy and keeps going with almost the same energy. Using the eikonal approximation the amplitude for this process can be calculated in impact parameter space as a sum of ladder and cross ladder diagrams. It turns out that [9, 17]

$$\mathcal{A}_{\rm eik}(\hat{s}, q) = 4\pi \hat{s} b_c^2 \; F_1(b_c q) \; , \tag{8}$$

where $\hat{s}$ and $\hat{t}$ refer to the Mandelstam variables at the parton level, $y = -t/s$, $q = \sqrt{-\hat{t}}$, $b_c = \hat{s}/(4\, M_5^3)$ and

$$F_n(u) = -i \int_0^\infty {\rm d}v \; v \; J_0(uv) \left(e^{iv^{-n}} - 1 \right) \; . \tag{9}$$

The differential νN cross section that we propose is then

$$\frac{{\rm d}\sigma^{\nu N}_{\rm eik}}{{\rm d}y} = \int_{M_5^2/s}^1 {\rm d}x \; xs \; \pi b_c^4 \, |F_1(b_c q)|^2 \; e^{-2m_c/\mu} \sum_{i=q,\bar{q},g} f_i(x,\mu) \, , \tag{10}$$

where $\mu = 1/b_c$ if $q < b_c^{-1}$ or $\mu = \sqrt{q/b_c}$ otherwise is the typical inverse distance in the collision and we have included a Yukawa suppression at distances larger than m_c (a numerical fit gives $|F_1(u)|^2 = 1/(1.57u^3 + u^2)$). Fig. 2 summarizes its main features. At low energies the new physics is negligible, and neutrinos interact with matter only through W and Z exchange. Above an energy threshold $E_\nu = M_5^2/(2m_N) \approx 10^6$ GeV the gravitational cross section grows fast, and it becomes much larger than the standard one at $E_\nu \approx 10^8$ GeV. This large cross section, however, is very soft (see Fig. 2b): the neutrino mean free path in ice becomes short (≈ 10 km at 10^9 GeV), but the fraction of energy deposited in each interaction is small ($\langle y \rangle \approx 10^{-5}$). Notice that, in addition to W-mediated collisions, only

[§]We use the same symbol y for the inelasticity and the label of the extra dimension hoping that it does not mislead the reader.



Figure 2: *(a) νN cross sections for proceses mediated by TeV-gravity and by W exchange. (b) Differential cross sections $y\,\mathrm{d}\sigma/\mathrm{d}y$ for $E_\nu = 10^9$ GeV. In both panels $M_5 = 1.7$ TeV and $m_c = 5$ GeV (solid), 50 MeV (dashed).*

the short distance interactions of $\langle y\rangle \approx 1$ or those resulting into a mini-black hole (see our estimate in Fig. 2a) are able to *stop* the neutrino when it propagates through matter.

The low-y end of the differential cross section in Fig. 2b is regulated by the arbitrary parameter m_c. If the mass of the lightest KK graviton is around 50 MeV, then a 10^{10} GeV neutrino would have several TeV energy depositions inside a km of ice, whereas values $m_c \approx 5$ GeV prevent the total cross section from reaching very large values.

Let us finally mention that, although our framework is unconstrained by astrophysics and cosmology, collider bounds would be similar to the ones obtained in any TeV gravity model. If a black hole is created one expects a high-multiplicity event with some jets and leptons of large E_T. These bounds, however, are weak for a low number of extra dimensions [5] (just one in our case) and very model dependent (for example, on the angular momentum of the black hole or on the minimum mass –in units of M_D– that it should have). Other experimental constraints could be obtained from the missing E_T associated to the production of the massive gravitons. In particular, an analysis of LEP data suggests bounds between 1.5 and 2.4 TeV on M_5 [14]. These bounds are also quite model dependent: they become weaker if, for example, we *hide* the right-handed electron in the UV brane. Notice that the particular model with just one extra dimension under study has not attracted the interest of the experimentalists at the LHC, as they may consider it excluded by astrophysical observations. In any case, we would like to emphasize that the very soft collisions that we propose, with

the incident particle losing a very small fraction of energy, are invisible in colliders: they imply new ultraforward physics, at rapidities out of reach there. The ideal place to test such type of cross sections is not colliders, it is IceCube.

4 Fit of the IceCube data

To fit the IceCube data we will use the cosmogenic neutrino flux in Fig. 1b [6] and the eikonal collisions discussed in the previous section. The cosmogenic flux is mostly produced in collisions of cosmic rays with the CMB radiation, and it consists of a few hundred neutrinos of energy between 10^8 and 10^{10} GeV per km^2 and year.

Cosmogenic neutrinos can reach the center of IceCube from zenith angles $\theta_z \leq 90^\circ$ and deposit there a small fraction of energy through an eikonal scattering. Notice that these soft collisions do not *destroy* the incident neutrino, which could actually interact once or several times in the ice before reaching the detector. However, short distance (both standard and gravitational) interactions will always prevent cosmogenic neutrinos from reaching IceCube from high inclinations (*i.e.*, upgoing directions). For example, a 10^9 GeV neutrino has a cross section $\sigma_{\nu N}^{CC} \approx 10$ nb for W exchange with a nucleon, or $\sigma_{\nu N}^{BH} \approx 8$ nb to produce a black hole[¶] through short distance gravitational interactions. However, the cross section for an eikonal interactions is much larger, $\sigma_{\nu N}^{eik} \approx 1\ \mu$b. Therefore, soft (long-distance) gravitational collisions would introduce in IceCube an excess of downgoing and near-horizontal showers only.

In Table 2 we give the number of eikonal events for the diffuse cosmogenic flux in Fig. 1 that corresponds to $M_5 = 1.7$ TeV, $m_c = 1$ GeV in a 3 year period. For comparison, we include our estimate using the diffuse E^{-2} flux proposed by IceCube.

It is apparent that the sum of the atmospheric background and our hypothesis provides the most accurate fit of the data. In particular, the likelihood ratio λ [18]

$$-2\ln\lambda = \sum_i^N 2\left(E_i - X_i + X_i\ \ln\frac{X_i}{E_i}\right)\ , \tag{11}$$

where E_i is the prediction, X_i the data and N the number of bins, gives a significant difference between both hypotheses:

$$-2\ln\lambda^{NP} = 5.9\ , \qquad -2\ln\lambda^{E^{-2}} = 15.4\ . \tag{12}$$

[¶]We take $M_5 = 1.7$ TeV and a geometrical cross section to produce a mini-black hole.

	Data	Atm	E^{-2}	NP	Data	Atm	E^{-2}	NP	
Tracks	2	0.8	0.6	0.0	0	0.0	0.1	0.0	UPGOING
Showers	5	2.7	3.6	0.0	0	0.0	0.7	0.0	$(+20^\circ < \delta < +90^\circ)$
Tracks	2	3.5	1.5	0.0	0	0.0	0.5	0.0	NEAR HORIZONTAL
Showers	8	5.9	6.4	4.2	1	0.2	2.6	1.9	$(-20^\circ < \delta < +20^\circ)$
Tracks	0	0.2	1.6	0.0	0	0.0	0.6	0.0	DOWNGOING
Showers	11	0.6	6.5	8.0	3	0.0	2.9	3.5	$(-90^\circ < \delta < -20^\circ)$
		30 – 300 TeV				300 – 3000 TeV			

Table 2: *Data, atmospheric background, excess from a E^{-2} diffuse flux, and excess from eikonal collisions of cosmogenic neutrinos ($M_5 = 1.7$ TeV, $m_c = 1$ GeV) in 988 days.*

If the 5 ambiguous tracks were included in the analysis, we would obtain similar values:

$$-2\ln\lambda^{NP} = 7.3\ , \qquad -2\ln\lambda^{E^{-2}} = 15.1\ . \tag{13}$$

5 Summary and discussion

The observation by IceCube of 37 events with energy above 30 TeV during the past 3 years is with no doubt a very remarkable and interesting result. Their analysis has shown (and ours confirms) that atmospheric neutrinos are unable to explain the data. Therefore, IceCube has most certainly discovered a neutrino flux of different origin. We think, however, that the determination of the nature and the possible origin of this flux is still work in progress.

The events observed do not exhibit a clear preference for the galactic disc and/or the galactic center. The best fit of the data by IceCube has been obtained using a diffuse cosmic flux with a spectrum proportional to E^{-2}. Since neutrinos can propagate without significant energy losses from very distant sources, an isotropic diffuse flux generated by the ensemble of all extragalactic sources in the universe is indeed expected.

This hypotesis, in principle, implies equipartition between the 3 neutrino flavors and a given distribution of zenith angles. Regarding the first point, it gives around 1 muon event per 4.5 showers, whereas the excess that we find in the data is around 18.6 showers and no muons (4 observed, 4.5 atmospheric events expected; if the muon background were included, we would observe 9 events but 12.9 expected). The expected number of tracks could be smaller if the efficiency to detect charged current ν_μ interactions (the effective IceCube mass for these processes described in in [1]) in IceCube were lower than assumed (see the

discussion in [19]). In any case, it seems clear that the uncertainties and the low statistics still available make the muon count compatible both with IceCube's E^{-2} hypothesis and also with the basic result in [20] (that we subscribe): muon topologies are well explained by the atmospheric flux, the only significant excess appears in the number of showers. As for the zenith angle distribution, we have distinguished 3 regions of similar angular size: downgoing, near-horizontal and upgoing directions. At PeV energies the Earth is (partially) opaque only to upgoing neutrinos ($+20^\circ < \delta < +90^\circ$). Therefore, IceCube's diffuse-flux hypothesis implies a similar number of events in the downgoing and horizontal bins. The data, however, reveals an excess of 13.4 shower events in the first bin but just 2.9 from horizontal directions. Of course, the low statistics gives little significance to these discrepancies[‖], but it also leaves plenty of room for alternative explanations.

We have proposed a scenario where the IceCube excess appears only in showers (no muon topologies) from downgoing and near-horizontal directions (no upgoing events) in a 2:1 ratio. It seems to provide a more accurate fit of the data than the E^{-2} flux hypotesis. The excess events are caused by *exotic* very-soft interactions of cosmogenic neutrinos, whose flux can be estimated with some accuracy assuming that the 10^{10}–10^{11} cosmic rays observed by AUGER [21] are protons[**]. The much larger energy of these neutrinos, around 10^9 GeV, prevents them from reaching IceCube from below, suppressing the flux in a $\approx 50\%$ already from horizontal directions.

We have defined a TeV gravity model that provides a neutrino-nucleon cross section with the precise features that are required. It should be considered as a particular realization of the generic type of models [12, 13] where UV physics is dominated by long-wavelength degrees of freedom. We think that an increased statistics at IceCube will establish whether new physics (see also [23]) is necessary in order to interpret the data.

Acknowledgments

We woud like to thank Carlos Pérez de los Heros and Monica Verducci for useful discussions. This work has been supported by MICINN of Spain (FPA2010-16802, FPA2013-47836, and Consolider-Ingenio **Multidark** CSD2009-00064), by Junta de Andalucía (FQM101,3048,6552), and by MIUR of Italy under the program Futuro in Ricerca 2010 (RBFR10O36O).

[‖]The main difference between IceCube's analysis and ours is that they seem to treat the atmospheric neutrino flux from the prompt decay of charmed hadrons as an error bar, whereas in our case it dominates over the flux from π and K decays at $E > 10^{5.5}$ GeV (see Fig. 1).

[**]Notice also that these soft interactions experienced by cosmogenic neutrinos are unconstrained by AUGER [22], since the energy deposited in the atmosphere, of order $yE \approx 10^6$ GeV, is below threshold.

References

[1] M. G. Aartsen *et al.* [IceCube Collaboration], Science **342** (2013) 1242856 [arXiv:1311.5238 [astro-ph.HE]].

[2] M. G. Aartsen *et al.* [IceCube Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **113** (2014) 101101 [arXiv:1405.5303 [astro-ph.HE]].

[3] A. Connolly, R. S. Thorne and D. Waters, Phys. Rev. D **83** (2011) 113009 [arXiv:1102.0691 [hep-ph]].

[4] J. I. Illana, P. Lipari, M. Masip and D. Meloni, Astropart. Phys. **34**, 663 (2011) [arXiv:1010.5084 [astro-ph.HE]].

[5] G. Aad *et al.* [ATLAS Collaboration], JHEP **1408** (2014) 103 [arXiv:1405.4254 [hep-ex]].

[6] K. Kotera, D. Allard and A. V. Olinto, JCAP **1010** (2010) 013 [arXiv:1009.1382 [astro-ph.HE]].

[7] C. Y. Chen, P. S. Bhupal Dev and A. Soni, Phys. Rev. D **89** (2014) 3, 033012 [arXiv:1309.1764 [hep-ph]].

[8] N. Arkani-Hamed, S. Dimopoulos and G. R. Dvali, Phys. Lett. B **429** (1998) 263 [hep-ph/9803315].

[9] G. F. Giudice, R. Rattazzi and J. D. Wells, Nucl. Phys. B **630** (2002) 293 [hep-ph/0112161].

[10] S. Hannestad and G. G. Raffelt, Phys. Rev. D **67** (2003) 125008 [Erratum-ibid. D **69** (2004) 029901] [hep-ph/0304029].

[11] S. Hannestad, Phys. Rev. D **64** (2001) 023515 [hep-ph/0102290].

[12] G. Dvali, G. F. Giudice, C. Gomez and A. Kehagias, JHEP **1108** (2011) 108 [arXiv:1010.1415 [hep-ph]].

[13] G. Dvali and C. Gomez, JCAP **1207** (2012) 015 [arXiv:1205.2540 [hep-ph]].

[14] G. F. Giudice, T. Plehn and A. Strumia, Nucl. Phys. B **706** (2005) 455 [hep-ph/0408320].

[15] M. Borunda and M. Masip, JCAP **1001** (2010) 027 [arXiv:0910.4532 [hep-th]].

[16] R. Emparan, M. Masip and R. Rattazzi, Phys. Rev. D **65** (2002) 064023 [hep-ph/0109287].

[17] J. I. Illana, M. Masip and D. Meloni, Phys. Rev. D **72** (2005) 024003 [hep-ph/0504234]; Phys. Rev. Lett. **93** (2004) 151102 [hep-ph/0402279].

[18] K. A. Olive *et al.* [Particle Data Group Collaboration], Chin. Phys. C **38** (2014) 090001.

[19] M. G. Aartsen *et al.* [IceCube Collaboration], arXiv:1410.1749 [astro-ph.HE].

[20] O. Mena, S. Palomares-Ruiz and A. C. Vincent, Phys. Rev. Lett. **113** (2014) 091103 [arXiv:1404.0017 [astro-ph.HE]].

[21] P. Abreu *et al.* [Pierre Auger Collaboration], Eur. Phys. J. Plus **127** (2012) 87 [arXiv:1208.6574 [astro-ph.HE]].

[22] P. Abreu *et al.* [Pierre Auger Collaboration], Adv. High Energy Phys. **2013** (2013) 708680 [arXiv:1304.1630 [astro-ph.HE]].

[23] A. Esmaili and P. D. Serpico, JCAP **1311** (2013) 054 [arXiv:1308.1105 [hep-ph]]; Y. Ema, R. Jinno and T. Moroi, Phys. Lett. B **733** (2014) 120 [arXiv:1312.3501 [hep-ph]]; A. Bhattacharya, M. H. Reno and I. Sarcevic, JHEP **1406** (2014) 110 [arXiv:1403.1862 [hep-ph]]; A. M. Taylor, S. Gabici and F. Aharonian, Phys. Rev. D **89** (2014) 103003 [arXiv:1403.3206 [astro-ph.HE]]; K. C. Y. Ng and J. F. Beacom, Phys. Rev. D **90** (2014) 065035 [arXiv:1404.2288 [astro-ph.HE]]; J. Zavala, Phys. Rev. D **89** (2014) 123516 [arXiv:1404.2932 [astro-ph.HE]]; Y. Ema, R. Jinno and T. Moroi, JHEP **1410** (2014) 150 [arXiv:1408.1745 [hep-ph]].